



Mailed *#13*

MAR 16 1999

Director's Office
Group 2700 4

PHILLIP IGBINADOLOR
240-27 CANEY ROAD
ROSEDALE, NY 11422

In re Application of Igbinadolor
Appl. No.: 09/135,504
Filed: June 22, 1998
For: INTEGRATED CAR DUBBING SYSTEM

: DECISION ON PETITION TO
: MAKE SPECIAL
: 37 CFR 1.102
:
:
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.102, filed January 27, 1999 to make the above-identified application special.

Petitioner(s) request that this application be made special under the accelerated examination procedure set forth in MPEP 708.02, Section II: Infringement.

A grantable petition to make an application special under 37 CFR 1.102 and in accordance with MPEP 708.02, Section II, must be accompanied by the required fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(i) and a statement in support of the petition stating:

1. that there is an infringing device or product on the market or method in use,
2. that a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device, product or method with the claims of the application was made,
3. that some of the claims are unquestionably infringed, and
4. that a careful search of the prior art was made or that applicant(s) have good knowledge of the pertinent prior art.

While applicant does not state that a careful search of the prior art was made, there was a prior art statement filed in the specification. In view that applicant has filed pro se, the prior art statement in the specification can be considered to meet the requirements of item (4) above. The petition meets the requirements for special status.

For the above stated reasons, the petition is Granted.

If the examiner can make this application special without prejudice to any possible interfering application, and the examiner should make a rigid search for such, the examiner is authorized to do so for the next action. Should the application be rejected, the application will not be considered special for the subsequent action unless the applicant promptly makes a bona fide effort to place the application in condition for allowance, even if necessary to have an interview with the examiner to accomplish this purpose.

If the examiner finds any intervening application for the same subject matter, the examiner should consider such application simultaneously with this application and should state in the official letter of such application that the examiner has taken it out of turn because of a possible interference.

Should an appeal be taken in this application or should this application become involved in an interference, consideration of the appeal and the interference will be expedited by all PTO officials concerned, contingent like upon diligent prosecution by applicant.

Upon allowance, this application will be given priority for printing. See MPEP 1309.

The petition is granted to the extent indicated.



James J. Groody (703) 308-5461
Special Program Examiner
Technology Center 2700
Communications and Information Processing